

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-3, 7,9 are all the claims pending in the application. Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

The objection of paragraphs 8 and 9 is respectfully traversed. The examiner ignores the fact that claim 3 is limited to sending information about the *specific area* in which the mobile terminal has been detected, and this is not found in claim 2.

The only prior art rejection is a rejection of all claims as unpatentable over the combination of Ayres, Trossen, Cohn and Kurimatsu. Ayres, Trossen and Kurimatsu are all previously relied on, the examiner now citing Kurimatsu (USP 7221903) for teaching the subject matter of the last three paragraphs of each of claims 1-3, and the last two paragraphs of claims 7 and 9.

Kurimatsu discloses that when video content is being transmitted and a user begins a voice call, the video content received during the call can be stored and then reproduced when the user is finished with the conversation. Reproduction of the stored video content preferably begins automatically on detection that the voice call has ended.

Kurimatsu thus arguably teaches part of what is recited at the end of the independent claims of the present case, i.e., storing video information while the user is engaged in a call and then reproducing it later. What Kurimatsu does not teach is that (1) the later reproduction is in response to a user instruction, and (2) even when the user is not on a call, displaying the video only for some time period, and thereafter storing the remainder and reproducing it only on user command.

Claim 1 has now been amended to clarify that the mobile phone stops displaying the video information while the user is still not using the mobile phone, which differs from Kurimatsu where the video display is only interrupted when the user begins a voice call.

It is also noted that, with automatic reproduction at the end of the call, Kurimatsu would not even be capable of feature (2) described above, i.e., stopping the video display while the user is still not using the mobile phone.

For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentable over the prior art. A similar clarifying amendment has been made to the other independent claims, so that all claims patentably distinguish over the art.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

/DJCushing/  
David J. Cushing  
Registration No. 28,703

Date: May 22, 2009